

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for the reasons of record stated on page 2 of the Office Action. Claim 19 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn and this claim allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over WO 97/16263 published in the name of Hansmann for the reasons of record stated on page 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over GB 2,204,321 published in the name of Chavannes for the reasons of record stated on page 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,529,788 issued to DeSenna for the reasons of record stated on page 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 4,448,750 issued to Fuesting for the reasons of record stated on page 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 4,308,229 issued to Voit for the reasons of record stated on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,464,477 issued to Awad for the reasons of record stated on page 5 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,770,550 issued to Motson for the reasons of record stated on page 5 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,372,741 issued to Tomaszewski for the reasons of record stated on page 6 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 - 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. 5,350,457 issued to Kitazawa et al. for the reasons of record stated on page 6 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. The Office Action indicates that the above references are anticipatory as they each teach surfactants. However, the references do not teach Applicants' ultrasonic cleaning composition having *inter alia* an inter facial tension of from about 10 mNm⁻¹ to about 0.0001 mNm⁻¹ which is substantially free of antifoaming agents in combination with the specific surfactants claimed by applicants. Hence, as the present invention is neither anticipated by nor obvious in light of these references, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn and the claims allowed.

SUMMARY

This is an RCE and response to the final Office Action dated October 24, 2003. Please charge any fees associated with this response to Deposit Account No.: 16-2480. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement and examination of Claims 35 - 37. These three claims were previously added and submitted with Applicants' response date July 29, 2003. As the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and §102 have been overcome, Applicants respectfully request these rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: JEAN-FRANCOIS ET AL.;

BY: 

Julia A. Glazer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,783
(513) 627-4132

January 26, 2004
Cincinnati, Ohio